

<p style="text-align: center;">MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL November 1, 2006 Aeronautics Building Lansing, Michigan</p>

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

Present

Carmine Palombo, Chairman
Robert Slattery, Vice-Chairman
David Bee, Member
Jerry Richards, Member
Kirk Steudle, Member
Susan Mortel, Member

Howard Heidemann, Member
Steve Warren, Member
Rob Surber, Member
Bill McEntee, Member
Spencer Nebel, Member
Frank Kelley, Commission Advisor

Staff Present

Rick Lilly- Bureau of Transportation Planning
Stacey Schafer- Bureau of Transportation Planning
Terry McNinch-Michigan Tech

Absent

None

Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m

Approval of October 4, 2006 Minutes - Rick Lilly

Mr. Richards moved for the approval of the October minutes as submitted, supported by Mr. Bee. Motion carried.

Correspondence and Announcements - Rick Lilly

None

Agency Reports

None

Monthly Report – Rick Lilly

Mr. Lilly handed out the monthly report.

Model test runs were done; this will be covered under the Data Management Committee report. Both models appear to provide the type of information the Council is going to need to make the recommendations to the State Transportation Commission. There has been a lot of training, and a report that will be discussed in regards to the conference.

Fiscal Year 2006 figures are neither final nor audited. At the end of the year \$1,408,169.06 of our budget will have been spent.

A number of agencies are interested in doing asset management (AM) plans. Mr. Lilly is going to give an update to the Council, every month, as to how many are actually doing AM. Five have been submitted and have been approved by Mr. Lilly.

Committee Reports

1. Administrative & Education

Mr. Nebel reported that there have been additional training sessions using the Cambridge Training Program. Mr. Lilly and Mr. Surber gave one of these classes in Marquette. November 20th is the next class, there are 72 registered.

Supplemental report to the legislature was discussed. Mr. Lilly stated that the supplemental will be done by the end of this month. It was indicated prior that a supplemental will be submitted at the end of the year. One of the things that were to be listed was the Bridge Condition data because our data was not available at the time the Council submitted its original annual report. Another is the RoadSoft presentation that was given to the committee.

The biggest portion will be on the investment data, there are a number of things that we can report on regarding the information received on the investment. Mr. Surber has a map of the number of agencies who have registered. 443 of the 617 agencies that have registered, the others have not. Of those registered 268 have reported data. This leaves us with 349 (43%) agencies that have not complied with the requirements of the law.

Mr. Stedule stated that we need to define functional class for the reader. We need to indicate what kind of traffic volumes are on different functional classes so that the reader understands. Mr. Lilly indicated that he will try to have this report to the Council by the December meeting.

2. Data Management

Mr. McEntee reported that Dave Juntunen gave a report on the bridge modeling process, both on federal-aid and off the federal-aid systems. We have very good information on the number of bridges and their various conditions (1-10 scale). A good report can be given on current conditions; it gets more difficult to project bridges out in the future given that many bridges are large. Another thing to consider is that we have added a number of bridges to the inventory over the last 8-10 years. A large part is due to freeway construction and separation of traffic. Mr. Juntunen is going to attempt to look at the issue of evaluating bridges based on square foot and deck area and will try to have this done by the next committee meeting.

The committee did see the software work for the RoadSoft model. They received a list of the data that is needed in order to have a high degree of confidence in the outputs of the software. It could take up to two years in order to get the good data we need. The committee is not comfortable with this and discussions have started on alternative solutions. We need to work on getting better data from the communities. Some of the needs are in deterioration curves for different types of pavement. We are struggling with the issue of composite pavements, which have a much different deterioration rate than other pavements. We need to pay much more attention to this on our data collection efforts to find out where those composite pavements lie. Costs continue to be an issue. The committee had trouble coming up with average project costs because some of the projects were "out of sight" cost. This could have been a result of other issues associated with that specific project as opposed to a representative cost of that type of work. A lot of work needs to be done over the next six months on cost data.

Mr. Lilly indicated that in dealing with the strategic model, in general, the Model Analysis Team (MAT) feels very good about the model and they like what they see. They believe that it works well with the data that they have. The issue is the accuracy of the data that goes into the model. This is critical. We need to check the data carefully before it goes in. One of the things the MAT wants to do with next series of runs is to clean up the list that was pulled out. We need to look at our work type codes and be able to do some checks there. Need to run it so we can see the sensitivity of the model, and see how it does when the 'clean' data is put in. We did not use current RQFS costs, we would like to go back and use the

current costs. MAT has a plan to start making some progress; they want to look at how we are going to close these gaps. Another possibility is an interim approach using a Markov approach similar bridge condition forecasting system uses. MAT thinks that they can use the same process dealing with Interim if it is forced to show something on a trend by using similar approaches to bridge condition forecasting system uses, using the PASER data.

Mr. Warren agrees that the data that is available statewide is probable the most comprehensive in terms of accounting for what we spent. Mr. Warren indicated that after the presentation last week, he is becoming less optimistic that we are ever going to get 100% compliance without some sort of law taking funds away. The committee and the Council needs to begin to look at how we can get investment data that has been reported and then begin to use statewide numbers and use some sort of extrapolation. We cannot wait for two years. We are getting to the point where something is better then nothing. We need to begin to have those discussions on what we can do with the data we have as opposed to our plan for getting 100% compliance. Mr. Richards agrees with Mr. Warren regarding the data and the difficulty we are having. This is not a new problem and has been an issue for several years. No matter what system we have, it's only going to work if we have good data. Right now we are talking about the construction and cost data, but the same argument is there for the PASER data itself. We really have to focus on making sure we get the good data, we have to let the Transportation Commission and the Legislature know that there is an issue of getting good data. Mr. Palombo suggested to Mr. Lilly that he work with Data Management Committee on putting together a very specific game plan that deals with how we overcome this. Mr. Palombo indicated that as a game plan is being put together, staff needs to look at those things and question some of those things about decisions made before and bring it back to the Council.

Approval of MTU Contract for 2007

Mr. Lilly asked the Council to look at two different authorizations.

The first being the 2007 work tasks for the model, Mr. Lilly was asked, by the Data Management Committee, to look at the requests and prioritize them. Mr. Lilly tried to tie the tasks, as much as he could, to the work program. This was done in a high, medium, and low priority. A sheet was handed out of the different amounts of time that would be spent on each area by Mr. McNinch and his staff. Mr. McNinch is asking for \$177,264.11 for this authorization. These

are all the things that are necessary to get the model running at the necessary level.

Mr. Warren moved for approval of items prioritized as high in the amount of \$177,264.11 supported by Mr. Slattery. Motion carried.

The second authorization is dealing with the training budget. This authorization would be turning over the directing of the training program, as well as teaching some of the classes, to Michigan Tech instead of having staff do it. Staff will continue to do the AM class so that there is some Council representation. This proposal would have 4, 1 day training sessions. Hold 10, 2 hour introductory sessions with townships, elected officials, etc. Also, this authorization would allow Michigan Tech to assist in the annual conference. The committee asked that on January 1st a list of dates be generated for these classes so that word can spread about them.

Mr. Nebel moved to approve the training budget authorization, supported by Ms. Mortel. Motion carried.

Approval of Increased Funding for Eastern UP Planning and Development Commission

Mr. Lilly is asking for approval to increase Eastern UP's authorization by \$1, 672, which brings them up to \$20,000. This is the minimum that all MPO/Region's get. This will also help to cover the TAMC Sault Ste. Marie meeting.

Mr. Bee moved to support Eastern UP Planning budget increase to \$20,000, supported by Mr. Slattery. Motion carried.

Approval of dates for 2007 Asset Management Conference

Mr. Lilly informed the Council that the planning committee met and came up with two dates for the conference. The conference in the Lower Peninsula can be held on April 11th at the Kellogg Center, and holding AM class on April 12th. In the Upper Peninsula, the conference would be held in Marquette. The committee is asking for a May 2nd date, and holding the Council meeting on May 1st; also to be held in Marquette.

Mr. Nebel moved the conference dates, supported by Mr. Bee. Motion carried.

Approval of 2007 Meeting Calendar

Mr. Lilly presented the Council with the 2007 TAMC meeting calendar. Based on the previous action we need to change May 2nd to May 1st because of the AM conference. The July 4th meeting date be moved to July 11th.

Mr. Nebel moved that we change the January 3rd date to January 10th, May 2nd date to May 1st, and July 4th date to July 11th, supported by Mr. Heidemann. Motion Carried

Update on PASER Data Collection – Rob Surber

Mr. Surber showed the Council the areas that have completed their Data Collection for this year. All of the areas indicated as completed have gone through CGI's quality control.

Mr. Surber noted that since the quality control checks by regions and MPO's, errors have been caught and corrected. This is a very positive thing.

Mr. McEntee indicated that he has not received any feedback or unresolved issues. Things are moving in the right direction.

Mr. Lilly stated that one comment he is hearing that the rankings are lower then they were last year. The training seems to be working and the raters are taking their time.

MDOT/MDNR Joint PASER Project – Bob Ranck, Jr.

Bob Ranck and Bruce Watkins requested a PASER rating in cooperation with MDOT/MDNR. If they could take another PASER rating, they would then be able to check their projects that they made from the first analysis. This would allow MDNR to have the framework system in place, two PASER rating points, mechanism to manage their data, and be able to hire LTAP to use this to manage their overall system. They are requesting that MDOT, TCS, and Regions use their own mechanisms and to take their own data point and go get the MDNR parks. Mr. Watkins indicated that this would best be done on a contract bases for MDNR.

Mr. Surber indicated that there are not many agencies out rating at this point.

Mr. Palombo is concerned that such agencies as the MPO's and the County Road Commissions may not have the manpower to perform this request,

Mr. McNinch indicated that Framework 5 does not indicate MDNR parks. Next years Framework 6 will have MDNR parks on it.

Mr. Palombo indicated that MDNR could send the Council a letter asking them to take ratings of MDNR parks in the Spring. Send out a request from the MDNR in terms of what they are looking for.

Public Comment

None

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.